R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 902 EA 000 059

EXCHANGE PATTERNS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROFESSORSHIP--AN ANALYSIS AND A STATEMENT OF POSITION.

BY- PIERCE, DOUGLAS R.
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

PUB DATE JUL 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.04 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY, *PROFESSORS, REWARDS, GRADUATE STUDY, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, COLUMBUS

SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY IS POSITED AS A MEANS FOR ANALYZING THE PROFESSORSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AS PART OF A COMPLEX SYSTEM OF PATTERNED RELATIONSHIPS AND INTERACTIONS WITH SCHOOLMEN, STUDENTS, AND OTHER PROFESSORS. CHANGES BOTH IN THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOOLS AND IN THE CONCEPT OF THE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION HAVE BEEN ACCOMPANIED BY A DYNAMIC PROCESS OF COSTS AND REWARDS TO THE PROFESSOR IN THE FIELD. EXPECTATIONS HAVE COME TO INCLUDE TEACHING, ADMINISTRATION, CONSULTATION, AND RESEARCH, AND ESPECIALLY THE SOCIAL ACCOUNTING OF DATA RELEVANT TO SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS. TO PROVIDE AN IMPROVED STRUCTURE FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION TRAINING, AN APPEAL IS MADE FOR SPECIALISTS IN PARTICULAR FIELDS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION RATHER THAN FOR GENERALISTS WITH QUESTIONABLE ABILITY IN THE BROAD RANGE OF RELATED FIELDS. THERE IS NEED FOR AN OPENNESS TO CONSTRUCTIVE CHANGE, FOR AN ESTABLISHMENT OF PARTICULAR RESPONSIBILITIES, AND FOR INSIGHTS ADAPTED FROM OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES. SPECIFIC CHANGES RECOMMENDED INCLUDE--(1) REALLOCATION OF SOCIAL ACCOUNTING TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND STATE AND FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL UNITS, (2) IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL ADEQUACY, (3) MORE ADEQUATE REWARD STRUCTURE TO PROMOTE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT BY THOSE COMMITTED TO THE FIELD, (4) INCREASED EMPHASIS ON RESEARCH SPECIALIZATION, WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW CAREER PATTERNS THROUGH RESEARCH POSITION, (5) REAPPRAISAL OF RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES FOR POTENTIAL STUDENTS, AND (6) REWORKING OF EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455, FOR $1.00. (JK)

ED010902

EXCHANGE PATTERNS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROFESSORSHIP

By Douglas R. Pierce

UCEA

a UCEA position paper

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

the University Council for Educational Administration

A000059

EXCHANGE PATTERNS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROFESSORSHIP: AN ANALYSIS AND A STATEMENT OF POSITION.

Douglas R. Pierce
University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A UCEA POSITION PAPER

The University Council for Educational Administration
65 South Oval Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43210
July, 1966

Additional copies are available from the
Department of Educational Administration,
College of Education, University of
Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55455

Price - $1.00

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	
OBSERVATIONS AND SPECULATIONS ON THE PROFESSORSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION	1
A PROBLEM OF PERPLEXING QUESTIONS	1
SCHOOL SYSTEMS, PRACTITIONERS, AND PROFESSORS	6
Expansion and Change in Education	6
Social Accounting: Demand and Response	8
Professors and the Provision of Supporting Services	10
Gatekeeping	14
STUDENTS AND PROFESSORS	15
Students: Press and Pressure	15
Mediating Influences on Professorial Behavior	19
GRADUATE SCHOOLS, ACADEMICIANS, AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROFESSORS	21
Exchange Values of Buffer and Developer Functions	21
Generalist Professors	27
Affluence and Seduction	32
Excursus on Managing and Understanding	33
ASSUMPTIONS AND POSITIONS	37
CONDITIONS OF PROSPERITY	37
DIFFERENTIATION: INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATION	37
PRIORITY SETTING	38
PROMOTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL ADEQUACY	39
THE POSITION: SYNTHESIS AND CRYSTALLIZATION	40
STRATEGY AND TACTICS FOR CHANGE	41

Preface

This position paper is designed to identify issues professors of educational administration need to confront, and to develop positions bearing on those issues. Speculative analyses by which issues are identified and from which positions are developed are incorporated into the paper.

This paper represents the second of three phases of a UCEA Task Force on the Professorship in Educational Administration.[1] It is part of a continuing dialogue among those interested in the present state and the future course of their profession. The analyses and proposals are in basic harmony with important recent contributions to the dialogue. Hopefully the document will be helpful to UCEA member institutions and central staff members engaged in the third phase of the Task Force, an ongoing examination of issues and development of action programs to improve the professorship in educational administration.

Deficiencies and problems of the educational administration professorship are accentuated in this writing--the objective is to confront issues. Lauding substantial positive developments of the past decade would have provided "sugar to help the medicine go down." Assuagement might foster complacency. Omission of laudation and emphasis of criticalness, thus, is a deliberate strategy, risking alienation to attain compellingness.

The counsel and criticism of numerous colleagues has been invaluable in the preparation of the position paper. An extended stimulating dialogue with Joan Egner and Donald McCarty promoted identification and delineation of basic issues confronted in the paper. Dan Lortie's penetrating criticism of an initial outline instigated utilization of social exchange theory to generate further ideas and to order analysis of the issues. Howard Eckel, Dan Lortie, and Herman Goldberg constituted the Task Force convened to react to a draft of the paper at Cornell University

---

[1]Donald J. Willower and Jack A. Culbertson, editors. The Professorship in Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, and University Park, Pennsylvania: The College of Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.

on March 18-19, 1965; Bryce Fogerty represented the UCEA central staff. Critiques of various drafts also were provided by Dick Carlson, Jack Culbertson, Clifford Hooker, Ken McIntyre, Sam Moore, Neal Nickerson, Samuel Popper, James Scamman, Francis Trusty, Don Willower, and Michael Usdan. Much help was given by other administrators, professors and students. Each will find his contribution reflected in the paper.

The paper ultimately represents the opinion of the writer. It is not designed to reflect consensus among those who assisted by criticizing drafts, nor is it designed to serve as an official statement of UCEA. Willingness to risk the task of criticism with a professor not thoroughly indoctrinated is encouraging.[1] I hope the resultant analysis and positions are perceived as valuable; I have found the challenge rewarding.

The excellent secretarial service so valuable in the preparation of a paper was provided by Elizabeth Cotanch for the initial drafts and by Bonnie Swanson for the final drafts.

Cornell University, and later the University of Minnesota, contributed extensive support to the development of this paper by providing ample time with protection against competing demands.

W. D. Snodgrass. "The Examination," Harpers Magazine. 223 (October, 1961) 154-5.

OBSERVATIONS AND SPECULATIONS ON THE PROFESSORSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A PROBLEM OF PERPLEXING QUESTIONS

Perplexing problems confronting professors of educational administration are many. How much should one be concerned with practical matters, and how much should one be concerned with developing basic knowledge? What knowledge is sufficiently pertinent and firm enough to warrant inclusion in preparation programs in educational administration? What kind of division of labor should be attempted among school administrators, professors of educational administration, and professors of economics and sociology? What are reasonable criteria for an adequate department of educational administration? To what extent does the professor tune himself to problems confronting school administrators? How does one learn to ask important questions and to ask them so that they are answerable? To whom is the professorship in educational administration accountable?

Getting such questions out in the open may lead to their being confronted more directly. Their constructive resolution may require rephrasing the questions to achieve greater precision, clarity, consistency, so that they become more answerable. Explanation for the questions, and underlying causes which generate the questions and which might yield a key to their resolution, may depend upon discovering or giving expression to a systematic means for asking right questions.

Some questions may be examined from the perspective of existing frameworks. For example, the issue concerning the allocation of resources for the improvement of present practice versus theory development, given the three-fold mission of teaching, service, and research, may be approached by shifting emphasis from a practice orientation to a theory orientation. The question, then, may be translated into problems of redefining promotion criteria, adjusting teaching loads, and promoting a new journal. Given the necessity of covering available pertinent knowledge, the problem of departmental staffing becomes one of deciding between an expert in data processing and one with competence, for example, in propositional sociology. Questions viewed within the context of existing frameworks, however, may elicit narrowly constrained answers. Perplexing questions answered from the perspective of present practice may not reasonably be expected to stay answered.

New perspectives may be derived through seeking underlying forces which are generating the questions. The professorship in educational administration, thus, takes as its subject the organization and administration of schools. It has tooled up on a model of schools as a local, static institution. However, for some years, schools have been undergoing fundamental adaptations brought on by social and technological changes in the larger society. The professorship's subject is undergoing transformation.[1] Gradually, the adaptations are being acknowledged. Institutional adjustments follow more slowly.[2] The university is notoriously conservative when it comes to re-tooling.[3]

The professorship in educational administration, then, may be regarded as in process of adapting to an emerging conception of its subject, with lack of agreement about both ends and means.[4] Some questions probe into what is appropriate grist for the mill. What phenomena constitute the distinctive and critical subject of the professorship? Is the professor acting within his proper domain when, on the basis of a local school plant survey which he conducted, he makes recommendations to a board of education regarding new construction? If he attempts to test the proposition

---

[1]Harold Benjamin. The Saber-Toothed Curriculum. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

[2]John K. Galbraith. The Affluent Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.

[3]Neal Gross. "Organizational Lag in American Universities." Harvard Educational Review. 33 (Winter, 1963), 58075. Kenneth S. Lynn suggests selective conservatism may be a general tendency of professions: "For all their intellectual vitality and daring receptivity to new ideas, the American professions are enormously conservative when it comes to changing the club rules." Introduction, "The Professions," Daedalus. (Fall, 1963), p. 652.

[4]James D. Thompson and Arthur Tuden, "Strategies, Structures and Processes of Organizational Decision," in James D. Thompson, et al., editors. Comparative Studies in Administration. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959.

that "a mobilization above par predisposes one to rationalism"[1] by analyzing word meanings used by high school teachers with differing teaching assignments, is he acting within his proper domain? What is the mission of the professorship in educational administration?

Other questions probe into probable consequences of different ways of milling the grist. What would be predictable outcomes of enlarging the talent pool from which to recruit graduate students for preparation programs in educational administration? Would a staffing policy emphasizing joint appointments, attempting to co-opt economists and sociologists into the study of educational organizations, be more likely to result in viable contributions than would a policy emphasizing appointment of persons prepared in departments of educational administration, who in addition possess strong orientation toward economics and sociology? What strategies will yield desired returns? Considerable mutual dependency among the ends-means questions compounds the difficulty in resolving them.

Knowledge of causation, although helpful, may be insufficient. To know that the scene has changed and that the professorship cannot continue to base its strategy upon the assumption that education is a local static institution, is probably requisite to resolution of perplexing questions. To depict the emerging character of educational organizations in relation to society may be useful. One may, for example, describe American education as a national system[2] functioning as a loose confederation[3] and vulnerable to technological obsolescence and poor organizational

---

[1]Hans L. Zetterberg. Social Theory and Social Practice. New York: Bedminster Press, 1962, p. 80.

[2]Sloan R. Wayland. "Structural Features of American Education as Basic Factors in Innovation," in Matthew B. Miles, ed. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

[3]Burton R. Clark. "Interorganizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10 (September, 1965), 224-237.

health.[1] This may suggest the desirability of bringing to bear economic and political perspectives upon educational organizations. It may suggest needed functions such as development[2] and organizational therapy.[3] Yet, it suggests no ready blueprints for restructuring role models for school administrators, professors of educational administration, and professors of economics and political science. It does not speak of how one goes about creating a "Developer" and what conditions are necessary to his effective functioning once created.[4] For this one needs a background against which he can perceive relationships among parts of the larger system.

---

[1]Richard O. Carlson. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," in Daniel E. Griffiths, editor. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. 63rd Yearbook, Part II. National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964; Matthew B. Miles, "Education and Innovation: The Organization as Context," in Max G. Abbott and John T. Lowell, editors. Change Perspectives in Educational Administration. Auburn: School of Education, Auburn University, 1965; Matthew B. Miles. "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

[2]Roald F. Campbell, "Training Research Professors of Educational Administration," in Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen Hencley, editors. Educational Research: New Perspectives. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

[3]Chris Argyris. Organization and Innovation. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin and Dorsey Press, 1965.

[4]Donald J. Willower has developed a conception compatible with Campbell's "Developer" model which provides answers to some of these questions. The formulation emphasizes continuity in knowledge, in theory and practice, and in professor's and practitioner's roles: "Professors and practitioners of educational administration ought to be reflective generalists, ready and able to work with ideas and to apply them in concrete situations." "A Rationale," in Willower and Culbertson, editors. The Professorship in Educational Administration. p. 100.

What is needed is a means for analyzing the professorship in educational administration as part of a complex system. One needs a way of ascertaining contributions of the professorship in educational administration sub-system to the overall mission of its supra-system. He needs some mechanism for discerning patterned relationships among various parts of the complex system.

A theory of social exchange affords such a means.[1] Social exchange theory explicitly focuses upon transactions among parts of a system and upon transactions between a system and its environment. It provides a systematic means for accounting for behavior in terms of costs and rewards. One may use this approach to attempt to calculate the state of the exchange balance, or account, of the professorship in educational administration. The calculation may indicate which transactions are yielding profit, which are accruing investment capital, and which are resulting in losses. Social exchange theory may suggest a useful strategy for approaching some perplexing questions confronting professors of educational administration.

Social exchange theory leads one to look for the explanation of patterns of activity in the relationships among elements in a structure, not in constituent properties or characteristics of persons or organizations. The behavior of a professor, thus, may be understood in terms of interactions with schoolmen, students, and other professors. The persistence or change of his behavioral pattern may be accounted for by the way in which it punishes or rewards other persons, who in turn reciprocate.

Lack of adequate data severely limits an attempt to analyze the professorship in educational administration. Hence, it is appropriate to label implications drawn from the following analysis for what they are, beliefs of the writer, cast as position statements to provoke serious thought, investigation, and ultimately action.

---

[1]An explication of elementary forms of social exchange is provided in George C. Homans. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961; an elaboration and extension to complex forms is presented in Peter M. Blau. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1964.

SCHOOL SYSTEMS, PRACTITIONERS, AND PROFESSORS

Expansion and Change in Education

Fundamental changes in the structure of American education have occurred since the inception of the professorship in educational administration in about 1900.[1] Public school enrollment in 1900 was about 15,000,000. Fifty years later, 25,000,000 pupils were enrolled in public schools. By 1964, enrollments totaled almost 42,000,000 pupils. Approximate numbers of teachers for the comparable times were 423,000; 913,000; and 1,575,000. Meanwhile, the number of school districts decreased substantially: from 100,000 in 1950 to about 29,000 in 1964.

The composition of the professional staff has also been changing. The percentage of men in teaching approximately doubled during the past one and a half decades. Now, nearly one in three public school teachers is a male. Since World War II, the level of preparation has markedly increased. In 1947-48, about forty percent of public school teachers lacked a Bachelor's degree, and only fifteen percent held a Master's or higher degree. By 1963, only eleven percent of public school teachers lacked Bachelor's degrees, and twenty-five percent held Master's or higher degrees.[2] Consonant with the increase in quantity and quality of teachers is employment of professionals that does not have the effect of reducing class size. A recent national survey showed an average of about 60 professionals per one thousand students, about 13 of which were classified as specialists. Overall, the trend of the past decade reflects an average annual increase of about one-half of a professional employee per one thousand students.[3]

---

[1]Raymond E. Callahan. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962, especially chapter 8, "A New Profession Takes Form." pp. 179-220.

[2]"Milestones in Teacher Education and Professional Standards." Washington, D. C.: Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission, National Education Association, 1964; Estimates of School Statistics, 1964-65. Research Report 1964-R17. Washington, D. C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1964.

[3]Bernard H. McKenna. Staffing the Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965, especially Part One, "How Many Professionals Are Needed and How Shall They Be Deployed?" pp. 1-54.

This same span has been depicted as a time of knowledge explosion.[1] Paralleling the knowledge explosion have been technological advances which have made more things possible, and have placed large demands on cooperative arrangements.[2] Simultaneously, the population has multiplied, become increasingly mobile, urban, affluent, and learned. Society has derived increased capability to allocate resources to investment in long-term human development. Strong demand for highly developed competencies of many kinds, in many persons, has accompanied the increase in capital available for long-term investment. Changes such as these briefly alluded to exert strong pressures upon the structure and function of American education. Transactions between society and the general system of American education, consequently, are diverse and changing. Correspondingly, exchange patterns linking professors of educational administration with various parts of the general educational system are in flux.

Social exchange processes are dynamic; they set up patterned, dialectic movements. A fundamental assumption of social exchange is that social actions are motivated by returns they are expected to elicit from others. Reciprocity is expected to continually recreate equilibrium. Precise equilibrium, however, is not regularly attained. Complex organizations entail interpenetrating substructures on numerous levels, and produce numerous incompatibilities. Attaining reciprocity in one substructure tends to produce imbalance in others. Imbalance may persist for prolonged periods until opposition forces mobilize sufficient strength to effect readjustment.

---

[1]Joseph J. Schwab. "Inquiry, the Science Teacher, and the Educator," The School Review. 68 (Summer, 1960), 176-195.

[2]Jerome S. Bruner. On Knowing. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962, especially "Fate and the Possible." pp. 159-165.

Growth in the size of the enterprise has necessitated structural change. A simple proposition derivable from the square-cube law (mass grows by a cube function while surface grows by a square function) is that as an organization grows, its internal shape must change.[1] Larger proportions of organizational resources must be allocated to supporting structures and maintenance functions.

Social Accounting: Demand and Response

As school systems have grown in terms of size, resources at their disposal, and kinds of activities in which they are involved, the need for social accounting has been vastly compounded.[2] School administrators need to know about their students: where they live, what kinds of competence and interest they have, and what kinds of goals and plans direct their lives. They need to know about drop-outs, successes and failures experienced by students, and the health of students. Such information is needed regarding students in private and parochial as well as public schools. Historical and current data are needed along with projections for future periods.

School administrators need to know about sites, buildings, and facilities: what they have, where, and in what condition. They need to know how to use what they have and how to get more. School administrators need to know about their staffs: their age, health, morale and satisfaction, certification status, areas of competence and of interest, and child-bearing patterns.

---

[1]Mason Haire, "Biological Models and Empirical Histories of the Growth of Organizations," in Haire, Mason, editor. Modern Organization Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 272-306. W. H. McWhinney has recently attempted to discredit the application of models derived in biological science, based in Euclidean geometry, to social organizations. He seeks another geometry more appropriate to the organizational world. "On the Geometry of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10 (December, 1965) pp. 247-363.

[2]Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Sam D. Sieber, Organizing Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

They need such information about bus drivers and custodians, teachers and coaches, and supervisors and principals. Information about several communities (the local geographic area, state, nation, and world) is needed: power structures, economic and social trends, and mobility patterns. Information is needed about salary schedules, state aid ratios, and comparative maintenance costs for carpeting, tile and wood floors. School administrators need to know about many things. They need information readily available, precise, and understandable. They need it immediately and continually. Growth in the educational enterprise has increased demand for comprehensive social accounting services.

In response to their increasing need for access to information and in view of increased resources at their disposal, many school systems have moved toward staffing persons with technical competencies in social accounting and toward developing facilities adequate to resolve operational problems of the system. Generally, higher levels of competence have accompanied the tendency toward internal specialization. With the increase in size and complexity, it has become time consuming and difficult for outsiders to obtain comprehensive and accurate information. Insiders may perform information procurement and processing functions more adequately.

Social accounting has constituted a major knowledge-producing activity engaged in by professors of educational administration. Surveys continue to constitute a major service provided by professors to school administrators. In earlier periods, school systems may have been incapable of collecting and organizing much information pertinent to operational problems. It may have been economical to buy such services from the outside. Professors of educational administration were well situated to provide such services. They possessed knowledge about how to operate a school system by virtue of backgrounds including administrative experience in schools. They were able to converse in language readily understandable and meaningful to school personnel. Their college or university posts provided status, time to perform services, and a basis for increasing their competence through observation and comparison in numerous school systems.

Professors and the Provision of Supporting Services

Individual professors may continue to secure attractive rewards through providing supporting services to school systems.[1] Results tend to be attained quickly and in highly visible forms. The work may result in immediate practical benefit to many people. The satisfaction of realizing that one is fulfilling a socially valued function is not lightly dismissed.

In the field, a professor may enjoy acceptance as "one of the boys," with an edge in status. Such ego support may be lacking in his campus environment. A vicious, snow-balling cycle may ensue; the availability of concrete and quick reward in the field may contrast markedly with tenuous and long-term rewards lodged in the university. The kind of activities and normative commitment appropriate to the former tend to be incompatible with the approach and attitude which is likely to be effective for the latter. Extensive rewards earned in the field may be at the expense of rewards including colleague support in the university. (Success in the university may be expected to increase the appeal of a professor to the field; however, it may not be associated with equivalent effectiveness in the field.)

Investment of time in field activities competes for time to maintain and increase expert knowledge. (Well-designed, non-routine field activities, of course, contribute to a professor's professional knowledge. Scholarly consultation[2] and systematic case analysis, especially involving colleagual teams rather than an individual, may facilitate testing and developing ideas, and may mediate against the professor becoming subject to client perceptions and preferences; such activities, however, are not so prevalent. Rather, routine "school plant survey" types of activity, yielding minimal understanding, continue to be a prevalent form of field service in educational administration.)

---

[1]Reward patterns are discussed in Lazarsfeld and Sieber.

[2]See Zetterberg for a description and illustration of scholarly consultation in social practice.

Alternate allocations of time by other professors may have an effect of decreasing his relative professional competence. Expert knowledge may quickly become antedated and ultimately obsolete. Lacking in expert knowledge, his colleague support depreciates. Concurrently, normative standards of the colleague group become less visible to him and less binding on his behavior.

Service activities may involve multiple exchange transactions and elicit several consequences. Private consulting for fee, an economic exchange relationship, is a common and lucrative "moonlighting" venture enjoyed mostly by a portion of senior professors. Usually such ventures have at least the implicit blessing of the university. A relatively low salary structure may represent an indirect exchange consequence. Entrepreneur income accrues primarily to a restricted number of senior professors; however, an indirect exchange for their privilege may be experienced by the professorship in general.

Consulting for fee depends upon developing a positive reputation among clientele and upon being visible and available. It encourages development of a local orientation. Most entrepreneur professors cannot afford to be mobile; they tend to become placebound. They become established and often influential in their university--sufficient at least to perpetuate entrepreneurship privileges and instrumental in departmental staffing, promotion, and resource allocation decisions.[1]

Colleague support is requisite to professional detachment. A professor primarily dependent upon clients for approval and support may be expected to become ineffective. He risks basing his decision upon preferences of the client. His judgments may tend to become oriented in terms of maintaining direct exchange transactions rather than establishing indirect patterns requisite to professional detachment.

---

[1]J. W. Gouldner. "Cosmopolitans and Locals," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306 (1957), 2:444-480 (1958); Theodore Caplow and Reece McGee. The Academic Marketplace, New York: Basic Books, 1958; Robert Presthus. "University Bosses: The Executive Conquest of Academe," The New Republic, 152 (February 20, 1965), pp. 20-24.

Professionalism involves a complex pattern of exchange among collectivities and between them and their individual members. Reciprocal exchange with clients is replaced by indirect transaction patterns: refrain from the rewards of direct social exchange with clients is compensated by positive sanctions provided by colleagues. Professional detachment is thus facilitated. The social community benefits from this detachment, hence, it provides rewards to the professional colleague group in the form of superior social status and a monopolistic franchise, enabling the colleague group to reward its individual members.

Provision of social accounting services to school systems is not a monopoly enjoyed by the professor in educational administration. School systems assume some of these functions within their own bailiwicks. Since professors' services are not necessary, a professor is less able to impose inviolate conditions upon his use by school systems.

Professors' activities may be put to various uses: they may be called upon as a delaying tactic, to raise a trial balloon or even to provide a scapegoat. Professors may be used to provide an opportunity for needed catharsis. They may articulate needs and problems of schools among men who influence purse strings, aid formulas, and certification requirements.

Professorial services may facilitate systemic linkage. School administrators need links with other personnel even within their own system, with personnel in other schools, governmental units and universities. Accounts of best practice may be transmitted among schools by professors. Professors may identify and facilitate approaches to resource materials and persons. University assignments for school administrators may be obtained; school administrators may assume teaching responsibility through accepting administrative interns and through extramural and summer session teaching appointments. Mobility of school administrators may be expedited through recommendation and placement activities of professors known through field activities. These may increase opportunity for professional growth, interaction, visibility and mobility.

Acknowledgement of technical expertise and professional competence in practitioners may be expected to release, albeit indirectly, additional resources for utilization in school systems. There may be an element of the self-fulfilling prophecy, for example, in professors acting as if they assume school systems do not possess sufficient competence to undertake to fulfill their own social accounting needs. A resultant lack of status may preclude establishment and maintenance of conditions requisite to effective social accounting activity. Further, it may encourage the presentation of conditions needed for performance of social accounting functions in relatively modest or compromising form. Hence, time and supporting facilities sufficient for the magnitude of the task may not be committed, precluding effectiveness. Thus, the professorship may find encouragement to perpetuate its performance of a service which, given adequate resources and some protection against subtle competition from a prestigious and entrenched ally, might better be performed by operating school systems.

The professorship's managerial role in school system operation may, in fact, support inadequacies in the educational system. Professorial services may shore up small operational districts that should be forced to collapse. Professors' overt efforts to foster the development of intermediate units, for instance, may be subverted by their own managerial activity.

Furthermore, involvement in managerial activity tends to subject professors to the prevailing ideology of the field.[1] Thus, their energies are invested in alleviating increasingly serious malfunctionings in educational organizations rather than in describing how the system operates and what might be probable outcomes of given changes in the system.

---

[1]Jean Hills. "Social Science, Ideology, and the Professor of Educational Administration," Educational Administrative Quarterly. 1 (Autumn 1965) pp. 23-29.

Gatekeeping

The professional mobility of school administrators (and aspirants) is highly dependent upon the professorship in educational administration. Gatekeeping takes various forms. Consortiums of senior professors in neighboring universities may perform screening and selection activities for school boards in need of chief school officers. Schools of education through carefully regulated notifications and recommendations may actively promote advancement opportunities for their alumni. The significance of these mechanisms pales, however, compared with the consequence of control over graduate study in educational administration. The department largely determines who shall be allowed to undertake study, in what areas, and for what period of time. Its professors judge the progress of candidates and channel them accordingly: grooming some for chief school officer slots in attractive communities, diverting others to assistant principalships in systems with tremendous growth potential, and seducing a selected few into the professorship.

Gatekeeping to positions of control in school systems is a powerful form of social control exacted by the professorship. It may have devolved from inability of school systems to reciprocate for professorial services with equivalent value. It is a particularly effective mechanism for perpetuating such imbalance.

Subordination is a cost of coordination; coordination, in this instance, is effected through gatekeeping. So long as the coordination yields net returns to those subordinated and is normatively interpreted among them as fair, recurrent exchanges will contribute to institutionalization. Conversely, normative interpretation of demands of agents of coordination as exploitive, and failure to attain net rewards from exchange transactions, creates opposition. Communication of feelings of exploitation among members of a collectivity tends to crystallize an opposition ideology.

Colleague groups of school administrators are well developed and are strengthening organizational control of members. They possess mechanisms such as AASA conventions which facilitate affective communications. Crystallization of support or of opposition is facilitated by such mechanisms. Through AASA, they have legislated that the professorship (specifically, units sanctioned by NCATE) shall constitute a legitimating agency for membership. Should professors be perceived as exercising this control capriciously or to the detriment of school operations, a primary base of legitimation of the professorship may be jeopardized.

STUDENTS AND PROFESSORS

Students: Press and Pressure

The professorship is defined in part by students it recruits, selects and socializes. These tend to be men who have taught some years, and perhaps held administrative positions. For the field of education in general, Berelson reports an average period of seven years of employment between receipt of a Bachelor's degree and commencement of doctoral study. This is twice the average for all doctoral recipients.[1] Educational administration students tend to be old relative to most graduate students. As typical school administrators, they are married and have children. They tend to be oriented toward action, toward seeking answers to immediate, practical problems confronted by administrators. Much of their study, at least initially, may be in extension courses and through summer sessions. (They may seldom encounter the core faculty, especially in supporting disciplines.) When they come into residence, it is frequently with a leave of absence for one year; occasionally, they come for longer periods. Once in residence they may elect to continue longer than they had anticipated. According to Berelson's survey, education students rank at the bottom of the list in regard to the incidence of full-time study.[2]

---

[1]Bernard Berelson. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 159. (Berelson's findings are subject to hazards of questionnaire surveys, do not provide information specific to graduate study in educational administration and are oriented primarily toward doctoral programs.)

[2]Berelson, p. 154.

Further, in terms of full-time equivalent years working on the doctoral degree, education students spend less time than any other group (2.8 years compared with a total sample average of 3.2 and a 3.7 average for the social sciences).[1]

Doctoral students in education select their own dissertation topic more frequently than do students in any other group (ranging from 19% selecting own topic in education down to 2% in physical sciences).[2] Then they spend less time working on the dissertation than any other group. (In median years, education students spend 0.9 compared with 1.7 in the physical sciences; in mean years, about half a year longer.)[3]

Education professors on the graduate faculty supervise over twice as many doctoral dissertations as the average number of $2\frac{1}{2}$ for graduate faculty (excluding the approximate third of graduate

---

[1]Berelson, p. 159.

[2]Berelson, p. 178.

[3]Berelson, p. 180. The subject of the dissertation might be speculated to be oriented to specific occupational goals; Earl J. McGrath has asserted: "The studies of the Institute of Higher Education provide unmistakable evidence that professional students, when given the opportunity to do so, organize their program of studies excessively around specific occupational goals. Teachers of specialized subjects typically encourage the practice." "The Ideal Education for the Professional Man," in Nelson B. Henry, editor, Education for the Professions. Sixty-first Yearbook, Part II, The National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 196, p. 287. The quoted assertion carries the following reference: Paul L. Dressel, Lewis B. Mayhew, and Earl J. McGrath. The Liberal Arts as Viewed by Faculty Members in Professional Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

faculty who, at a given time, are supervising no dissertations).[1] Further, ABD's ("all but the dissertation," of whom about three-fourths are still actively after the degree) constitute a more serious problem in education than in other fields. The average graduate faculty member has about two ABD's under sponsorship ranging to a high of five in education. Berelson succinctly describes consequences:

> "The situation is uncomfortable and undesirable to all concerned. The uncompleted dissertation hangs over the candidate like a black cloud interfering with his career, his domestic life, even his peace of mind. The employing institution wants him to finish and often uses salary or promotion as pressure for completion so that another Ph. D. can be added to the rolls; too often the situation is a source of continuous tension between the young faculty member and his employing department of administration. The doctoral institution has the problem of keeping track of the candidate and the worry of another potential case of attrition so near the end of the line, the department feels it must pass an inferior product for neatness' sake, and the major professor is faced with another case of thesis supervision at long distance and in bits and pieces."[2]

There are relatively few post-doctoral fellows in education compared with most disciplines. This agrees with the small proportion of graduate faculty and recent recipients of the doctoral degree in education who feel post-doctoral training is necessary or highly desirable for advancement (about one-third of the faculty in education think so, compared with about one-half in the social sciences and two-thirds in the natural sciences; about one-sixth of recent recipients in education think so, compared with slightly over one-fourth in the social sciences and natural sciences.)[3] Again, this seems to support the finding that both faculty and recent doctoral recipients in education

---

[1]Berelson, p. 179.

[2]Berelson, p. 171.

[3]Berelson, p. 190-191.

tend not to describe the state of the discipline as "very satisfactory" (only 18% of the faculty and 25% of recent recipients in education described the state as "Very satisfactory;" this was near the bottom of the ranking in Berelson's survey).[1]

The students with whom professors of educational administration transact tend not to be inclined toward delayed gratification. Perhaps the potential rewards they anticipate do not warrant much long-term, high-risk investment in graduate study. Such study, too, may appear to remove them from normal career progression at a crucial stage. It commonly necessitates a substantial reduction in income frequently accompanied by a sense of loss of power and of status.[2]

The negotiability of increments of graduate study compounds the student's decision problem. If completion of a program was necessary to secure any of its rewards, a decision once made could be expected to garner rationalization for its support. However, the graduate student in education is continually confronted with the moot question whether he should cash in his chips and invest the accumulations in educational administration. He may elect the option of both alternatives, continuing graduate study concurrent with employment in educational administration; and, according to redemption clauses in "Green Stamp Plans" in common usage among school systems, with almost any small increment of graduate credit "stamps" he may obtain a salary increase. A standardized "book" need not be filled prior to redemption.

Colleges of Education seem willing accessories, providing evening and Saturday classes according to demand, offering an intermediate degree or certificate, and permitting students to interrupt and recommence graduate study largely at the student's discretion. Doctoral program planning materials not infrequently

---

[1]Berelson, p. 212.

[2]Alfred G. Smith. Communication and Status: The Dynamics of a Research Center. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966.

incorporate built-in check-points in the form of a Master's degree and a Specialist's certificate. A student may cancel without penalty at these intermediate points. Probably more common in actual practice are doctoral programs tacked on top of Specialist certificate programs, in turn, additive to Master's programs.

The open-endedness of graduate study in educational administration is further evident in lack of insistence upon career choice and program differentiation. Commonly, students completing doctoral degrees simultaneously apply for disparate kinds of positions. Lack of program differentiation is reflected by this prevalent practice. Even the exceptional student who makes an early commitment to a career as, for instance, a research-oriented professor of educational administration, may expect to confront essentially the same program pursued by an undecided or perhaps, opportunistically-oriented candidate.

Mediating Influences on Professorial Behavior

Lack of commitment to prolonged, full-time graduate study may act as a mediating influence upon behavior in the professorship. Should a professor feel constrained to teach, to profess, he may be unduly vulnerable to student preferences. Teaching tends to be highly valued in colleges of education.[1] It is unlikely that many professors of educational administration are not susceptible to a compulsion to have students under their tutelage. A compulsion among professors to have students under tutelage and lack of commitment among students to full-time, prolonged graduate study may be associated with behavior oriented in terms of immediacy and concreteness. It may be expected to foster a trade school orientation. Such conditions may tend toward self-perpetuation.

---

[1]Roald F. Campbell. "The Professor in Educational Administration: Preparation," in Willower and Culbertson, editors, The Professorship in Educational Administration. p. 17.

The likelihood of professors becoming susceptible to responding to student wants as against needs may be increased when students also engage in transactions with professors in capacities other than as student. A part-time student, albeit full-time school administrator, may accept placement of an administrative intern under his supervision. He may accept teaching assignments in an extension division and in a summer session. In such instances, the student becomes a quasi-colleague of the professor.

Too, a professor's entrepreneur income may be partially controlled by part-time students. Extension instruction, workshops, and in-service education programs may be conducted according to the discretion of administrators. Not infrequently, they provide professorial remuneration on the basis of the number of participants completing the course or program. Should the professor be inclined to continue such activity, he may take pains to please.

Should he desire access to a school for research activity, he may feel obligated not to disregard future preferences of an administrator who grants such access. He may anticipate future access needs, too, and avoid displeasing prospective administrators. Professors of educational administration may be particularly vulnerable to basing their actions on client perception and knowledge.

Professorial-student transactions based upon such direct social exchange expectations may be expected to be "filling without satisfying." Requirements upon faculty and students may be no less demanding than imposed under an alternative basis. Yet, corresponding benefits will not be attained. Students may not be expected to become substantially different for having engaged in the transactions. Their established patterns of behavior and value systems will not be challenged. Alternative models will not become visible. A professor drawn into the value system of his student cannot serve as a catalyst for the examination of that value system. His function is limited to the improvement of operational patterns within the prevailing framework.

GRADUATE SCHOOLS, ACADEMICIANS, AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROFESSORS

Exchange Values of Buffer and Developer Functions

The professor in educational administration exists within the context of the university graduate school. A primary mission of the graduate school is to discover or create knowledge--which may have a consequence of challenging established value systems. Various sub-systems provide instrumentalities by which the increase of knowledge is fostered.

Attainment of the knowledge-producing objective depends in part upon relationships among the sub-systems. Both direct and indirect exchanges among sub-systems must be taken into account to ascertain whether a given unit's activity is functional or dysfunctional. Perhaps the educational administration professor's current contribution to the change function of the university is indirect and hence, little visible. Transactions involving the professorship in educational administration with professorships in disciplines such as sociology indicate that this may be the case.

Perhaps, in terms of life cycle, the professorship in educational administration is in its adolescence.[1] At least the field

---

[1]George E. Miller has provided a valuable discussion of the development of medical education, illuminating striking parallels with developments confronting educational administration professors. To sample selectively: "The staggering developments in the understanding of disease and its control and the optimistic expectation of further advances within the lifetime of those already adult can be traced in large part to the research spirit generated in contemporary university medical schools and their affiliated institutions". . . "This development has, however, moved medical faculties away from the profession of which they are a part and for which they provide professional education." "Medicine," in Henry, editor. Education for the Professions. p. 118. Further discussion of relations between scientists and professionals is provided by Harold L. Wilensky. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology. LXX (September, 1964) pp. 137-158.

has been recently depicted as in ferment.[1] Within the period of ferment, professors of educational administration discovered the existence of knowledge in disciplines such as sociology. Prior to the ferment period, knowledge of other fields was largely ignored.[2] Perhaps while the professorship in educational administration was in its infancy, it was in no position to attempt any exchange transactions with well-established and somewhat insular disciplines. Entering an exchange relationship with an established contender and in an arena in which both parties depend upon a common source of supply for their subsistence, entails obvious risks. The status of borrower illustrates one consequence. Professors of educational administration are now consuming research, time and subsistence resources of men in other disciplines, particularly in the area of organization behavior, often directly and without much recompence. The obligation is partially honored in the form of deference and low prestige. Better students majoring in educational administration are sent to courses of anthropology professors and economics professors. Educational administration professors invite psychology professors to address their conferences and to collaborate on studies. Students from anthropology and economics departments who appear before professors of educational administration too often are discards and rejects. Invitations to speak, consult, or research with psychology professors are notable by absence. This is preferable to the early, self-imposed, isolation, yet it entails risks.

It is not a minor problem, for instance, to learn several dialects of jargon.[3] Especially is this so when the language systems derive from different cultural systems. Yet, to engage in social exchange with professors in established disciplines,

---

[1]Hollis A. Moore, Jr., "The Ferment in School Administration," in Griffiths, editor. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. 1964, pp. 11-32.

[2]Mort, for instance, has been depicted as "aggressively ignorant of available knowledge:" Miles, "Planned Change . . ." p. 12.

[3]Andrew W. Halpin. "Problems in the Use of Communication Media in the Dissemination and Implementation of Educational Research," in Stanley Elam and Keith Goldhammer, editors. Dissemination and Implementation. Third Annual Phi Delta Kappa Symposium of Educational Research. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1962, pp. 171-200; reprinted in Andrew W. Halpin. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

an educational administration professor is confronted with the necessity of learning their jargon which may be expected to reflect a syntax different from his. To effectively employ Amitai Etzioni's notions about charisma in accounting for the participation of two sets of elites in an elementary school, necessitates thorough familiarity with his complete formulation.[1] To attempt a more comprehensive explanation employing in addition Phillip Selznick's notions about vulnerability of an institution, necessitates familiarity with the additional formulation and as well, critical care not to confuse components of the two formulations.[2] The precision of such formulations contrast markedly with the notion of "the principal as instructional leader."

The technical language employed by Etzioni and Selznick entails operational definition of principal terms and avoidance of metaphorical denotation. It represents the language of science ". . . concerned with the precise description of events and experiences . . . based upon a probabilistic view of the world . . . to purge itself of value commitments and exhortations to action . . ."[3] Conversely, the jargon of educational administration has tended toward the language of politics, ". . . designed to persuade, to exhort, and to incite listeners to action . . ."[4] Understandably, the operational referents of technical symbols in a discipline such as sociology pose a substantial problem for one oriented in the service tradition of educational administration and accustomed to the language of politics.

---

[1]Amitai Etzioni. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961. The abbreviated explication in his Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964, is not sufficient.

[2]Philip Selznick. Leadership in Administration. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.

[3]Halpin, p. 186.

[4]Halpin, p. 187.

The production of basic knowledge has been a predominant mission, although not uncontested, in disciplines such as sociology.[1] Resultant findings and processes have in varying degrees been incorporated into the knowledge and practice of professors of educational administration. For instance, Daniel Griffiths and others recently adapted Robert Presthus' typology of responses to structured authoritarian stimuli (derived in turn from Robert Merton's more general formulation) to categorize New York City teachers.[2] Ralph Kimbrough has been effectively adapting the reputational approach employed by Floyd Hunter and the issues technique employed by Robert Dahl in investigation of informal power structures affecting educational policy decisions.[3] Samuel Popper has just com-

---

[1]Fred E. Katz. "Analytic and Applied Sociologists: A Sociological Essay on a Dilemma in Sociology." Sociology and Social Research. 48 (July, 1964), pp. 440-448. Research and service choices plague sociology as well as educational administration. Most fields confront such an issue: An illustration from a field considered rather practically oriented is provided in an editorial by Richard L. Tobin. "Journalism's Mounting Storms," Saturday Review, (December 4, 1965) p. 36. Robert M. Hutchins articulates his confrontation with the general issue in an article in the same issue titled "First Glimpses of a New World," pp. 33-35, 93-94.

[2]Daniel E. Griffiths, et al., Teacher Mobility in New York City. A Study of the Recruitment, Selection, Appointment and Promotion of Teachers in the New York City Public Schools. New York: Center for School Services and Off-Campus Courses, School of Education, New York University, 1963; an abbreviated report is available in Daniel E. Griffiths, Samuel Goldman, and Wayne J. McFarland, "Teacher Mobility in New York City," Educational Administration Quarterly. 1 (Winter, 1965) pp. 15-31.

Robert K. Merton. Social Theory and Social Structure. revised edition, Glencoe: Free Press, 1957.

[3]Ralph B. Kimbrough. Informal County Leadership Structure and Controls Affecting Educational Policy Decision-Making. Cooperative Research Project No. 1324. Gainesville, Florida: College of Education, University of Florida, 1964.

Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Robert Dahl. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

pleted a comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the middle school relying predominately upon theoretical formulations from the social sciences, especially those of Talcott Parsons and Philip Selznick.[1]

Instances of knowledge and processes derived in the professorship in educational administration incorporated into the working habits of sociologists or economists, conversely, are difficult to cite.

Obviously, professors in educational administration value some of the knowledge and processes of several established disciplines. Evidently, too, those fields have found little of value in educational administration. Choices of the professor of educational administration, given this situation, include going without the pertinent knowledge or methodology, attaining it from another source, or accepting it and assuming an attitude of deference toward its producers. Contributions from the professorship in educational administration to knowledge in general, and particularly in forms usable by professors in fields such as sociology, are needed to attain a more favorable exchange relationship.

An alternate is exchange in different terms or on another dimension. Indirect exchange patterns may contribute to a favorable balance. The professorship in educational administration may mute some demands on professorships in disciplines such as sociology and, thus, reciprocate. A social community which supports knowledge production through a system of indirect exchange tends not to recognize the nature and conditions of the exchange system. Community members tend to interpret the relationship in terms of direct social exchange; relatively immediate

---

[1]Samuel H. Popper. The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis. New York: Blaisdell, forthcoming, 1966.
Talcott Parsons. Structure and Process in Modern Society. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.
Philip Selznick. Leadership in Administration. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.

and utilitarian return on the investment is expected. Such demands are incompatible with conditions requisite to the creation of knowledge. Knowledge production tends to be a long-term, high-risk endeavor. It depends upon attitudes of detachment and cautiousness. Protection from demand for quick, practical results may be requisite to success. It may be to sociologists' advantage to have educational administration professors absorb some public demand for action.

Further, developer functions are necessary to transform basic knowledge into utilitarian forms. Innovators are needed to devise applications for new discoveries. Too, disseminators and demonstrators are needed to inform and convince target groups of the existence and utility of relevant innovations. Devising and promoting innovations requires involvement with operations and problems of clients. A helping role in which the guiding motive is to increase immediate capability to manipulate an organization necessarily emphasizes the importance of establishing a cooperative working relationshi with clients accompanied by boldness on the part of the therapist in helping improve the practitioner's organization.[1] Such a stance is incompatible with the detached, cautious attitude of one whose guiding motive is to derive understanding.

Professors of educational administration, then, may serve as middlemen, developers, perhaps as buffers, between professors in disciplines which engage in the creation of basicly new ideas and the larger social community. Thus they may reduce pressures upon sociologists and garner an increment in the exchange transaction.

The role of developer appears deceptively simple. Development necessitates breadth of knowledge without compensating de-emphasis upon depth. A professor as developer requires thorough understanding of many different conceptions used to order knowledge. He risks, otherwise, confusing terms among possibly complementary formulations precluding their individual as well as collective utility. Eclecticism is not a less demanding approach for the less able scholar.

---

[1]Warren G. Bennis, "A New Role for the Behavioral Scientist: Effecting Organizational Change," Administrative Science Quarterly. 8 (September, 1963) 125-165; Harold Guetzkow, "Conversion Barriers in Using the Social Sciences," Administrative Science Quarterly. 4 (June, 1959) 68-81.

In addition, a developer role necessitates knowledge of peculiarities of the client's organization as well as a normative commitment to involvement with clients. Without accurate and specific information about his client's organization, he cannot provide valuable help.

Even given all this, improvement may be limited without adequate communication between developer and client. Potential innovations must become open to understanding by participants in the target organization. Developmental processes may consequently appear most deceptively simple in retrospect.

Both the developer function and the demand-muting function afford low visibility. High status is not likely to accrue from such functions. License to deviate is restricted to high status. Yet, deviation is integral in the developmental mission.

The likelihood of the professorship in educational administration garnering increments for social exchange through attempting these functions is low. They provide ample opportunity to err and to offend. Avoidance or surmounting of the obstacles probably requires greater resources than are presently allocated to the professorship in educational administration. Attainment of adequate resources for developmental functions probably depends upon first taking another tack, fulfilling some other function.

Generalist Professors

The way in which the educational administration professorship sub-system is structured influences its functioning.[1] Departments of educational administration were initially organized so as to facilitate instructional coverage of areas considered to be the province of educational administration. Certification regulations, student and administrator expectations,

---

[1]Daniel E. Griffiths. "The Professorship in Educational Administration: Environment," in Willower and Culbertson, editors. The Professorship in Educational Administration. pp. 29-46.

and institutional convention ensure that courses continue to be offered in established areas. Addition of staff personnel has tended to be viewed in terms of attaining greater breadth or, perhaps, simply actual competence and interest in areas formerly covered by the staff (not uncommonly one man). New structures, for instance, a staff organized so as to derive knowledge in selected areas appropriate to educational administration, may be expected to encounter resistance.

Selection and socialization processes tend to perpetuate existing organizational arrangements. Professors of educational administration tend to be or become generalists. In part, this may reflect a generalized expectation for the professor in America:

> "The same individuals who are expected to provide professional training are also expected to advance knowledge in their field and to improve professional practice through consultation and advisory services to those that need or demand them in the extra-university world. In short, the academic role has been gradually redefined to embrace the variety of diverse tasks that the university has assumed. Whereas other establishments have characteristically met similar situations with increased specialization and further division of labor, the university has primarily chosen the path of adding function after function to the tasks of the same personnel."[1]

Actually, the professorship has shed major tasks such as supervision of student conduct. Further,"The role itself is also currently undergoing extensive 'internal' differentiation with a string of roles appearing in the guise of one."[2] Thus,

---

[1]Gross, p. 61.

[2]Burton R. Clark. "The Sociology of Educational Administration," in Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965, p. 56.

Lack of understanding about the phenomena of specialization within a discipline has been noted by Mary Jean Huntington, "Sociology of Professions," in Hans L. Zetterberg, editor. Sociology in the United States of America: A Trend Report. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1956, pp. 87-93.

to speak of the professorship in educational administration tends to be misleading, obscuring actual differentiation of role performance expectations for different "types" of professors of educational administration. Still, Gross' inclusive role model probably describes the most prevalent perspective of the professorship; although this view may represent conventional wisdom, nonetheless, it influences behavior.

The tendency to be or become generalists may also reflect prevalence of a generalist myth which in its purest embodiment tends to assume that the general administrator is competent in all spheres. The generalist myth denotes "the assumption, fostered mainly by the public schools and Oxbridge, that a liberal education augmented by certain personal qualities of 'character,' poise, and 'leadership' provides the best basis for dealing with complex problems of modern government and industry."[1] A professor of administration may be particularly susceptible to such a "Renaissance Man" aura.

Roald Campbell, on the basis of a survey by R. Jean Hills and his own analysis of requests to nominate professors, recently concluded that "Teaching classes is still the chief function of the professor of educational administration and the one for which his institution is most willing to reward him. Most professors are generalists; little attention has been given to differentiating the content of the field. Experience in administration may be seen as more significant preparation than a university program of preparation for the professorship."[2] An analysis by Judson Shaplin of responses to a questionnaire about the desired image of the professor yielded an impression of random numbers regarding interrelationships among "experience," depth, and breadth in social and behavioral sciences. Although some tendency toward specialization was suggested, no clear image emerged.[3]

---

[1]Robert Presthus, "Decline of the Generalist Myth," Public Administration Review, 24 (December, 1964) 211-216, p. 211.

[2]Campbell, "The Professor of Educational Administration: Preparation," p. 17.

[3]Judson T. Shaplin, "The Professorship in Educational Administration: Attracting Talented Personnel," in Willower and Culbertson, editors. The Professorship in Educational Administration. pp. 1-14.

The preponderance of professors of educational administration, old and new, has not been prepared to perform the kinds of activities associated with production of basicly new knowledge. They may be expected to lack the kind of skill and the kind of normative commitment compatible with research; their skill and normative commitment may tend to be more compatible with requirements of administrative activity.[1]

Generalists may not be expected to value collaborative activity; values of collaboration are largely dependent upon functional differentiation.[2] It is fairly common for an educational administration professor to teach a diverse array of subjects. Probably, too, most educational administration courses are fairly self-contained, little dependent upon other courses and experiences. Simple inspection of college catalogs reveals few prerequisites attached to educational administration courses. Further, repetitiveness is a common student gripe. Casual observation also supports the speculation that student performance in most educational administration courses may be lowly correlated with sequence.

Field service activities may entail a low level of collaboration, too, despite a collective form. School plant surveys frequently entail utilizing several professors and other personnel in inventory existing facilities and sites, but such activity does not necessitate a high level of specialization, and in fact, requires similar activity on the part of most or all participants rather than functional differentiation.

Functional differentiation may be expected to be more evident in research endeavors. Even a modest research project may require high levels of competence in disparate fields.

---

[1]Smith; R. Jean Hills. A Secondary Analysis of "Communication And Status: The Dynamics of a Research Center." Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966.

[2]Victor A. Thompson. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961, especially chapter 3, "Specialization," pp. 25-57. Also see Bruner.

Further, research tends to be a relatively high-risk activity. Long periods may lapse between conception of a researchable idea and termination of research activity, perhaps with indeterminate findings. Actual activity may deviate markedly from schedule. Predicted results may not be forthcoming for a multitude of reasons. Initial and prolonged investment of oneself in such an endeavor, consequently, may be partially dependent upon colleague support manifested in collaboration.

An organizational arrangement designed for broad instructional coverage, buttressed by participants with generalist characteristics may be predicted to support weak, individualistic norms. Outcomes of teaching are notoriously difficult to discern; teaching behavior under typical university arrangements has comparable visibility. Norm formation is limited by lack of performance measures. Norms which develop may tend to have a protective function for individualistic behavior. Common school teacher norms in terms of an "autonomy-equality" pattern have been explicated by Dan Lortie; appropriate behaviors include acting toward all teachers in a friendly matter, treating all teachers as equals, and avoiding criticism of others' teaching behavior.[1] There may be some spill-over of such norms into the professorship in educational administration. It appears that a professor is expected to be master of whatever courses he teaches; cooperative course planning and instruction seems not to be positively sanctioned (neither is it negatively sanctioned, however). Research (which accounts for a very small proportion of the professor's time) tends to be individually designed and conducted, excepting graduate student assistance, although a trend toward collaborative research may be existent. Collaborative writing is more evident, and cooperative field service activities are common (hence, performance norms for field service activities might be predicted to possess greater specificity, clarity, and to be more binding than norms for other professorial activities). Criticism of colleagues' work tends to be limited. Social interest and activity may constitute a predominant basis for colleague interaction. Specific, clear, and binding performance standards do not appear to be well developed for the professorship in educational administration.

---

[1]Dan C. Lortie, "The Teacher and Team Teaching: Suggestions for Long-Range Research," in Judson T. Shaplin and Harold F. Olds, Jr., editors, Team Teaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Affluence and Seduction

The professor in educational administration is part of the generally affluent academic community (affluent in terms of prestige and lack of restraint in working arrangements). His productivity, relative to the academic community standard, yields small returns. Existence in an affluent community on a sub-standard income may be expected to promote susceptibility to seduction. Resistance depends upon a well established value system or the availability of alternative avenues to need satisfaction. Colleague support can provide an alternative avenue; concurrently, it contributes to social value formation. As yet, the normative ethic of the professorship in educational administration is not highly developed, nor is a sense of colleagueship widely established and salient.

Tenure, rank, and salary--embodiments of a professor's exchange value--are reckoned according to visible productivity. Particularly for neophytes, activities with quick, visible pay-off are promoted. Long-term, high risk activities are simply unreasonable choices. A man not regarded early as a "comer" is a "goner."

Survival and growth depend upon securing control of proportionally more resources. The largesse of foundations is a source available to professors of educational administration. Foundations cannot often retain their privileges and directly install their values in relevant target systems. Foundations can, however, honor proposals which promise to demonstrate the utility of values held by foundation influentials. Professors, then, may be co-opted into developer functions, particularly demonstrator and disseminator activities.

Lacking productivity in terms of the established currency of academia, the educational administration professorship is hard put to resist pressures toward grantsmanship. Financial support for the department, particularly for expansion, may depend upon obtaining a training or demonstration grant which usurps the very time, energy and attitudinal approach requisite to the discovery of knowledge and creation of new ideas, highly valued in the exchange system of the university.

Entrenched expectation for training and services carries piggy-back an attitude which supports the status quo: research activity comes after the regular duties of the educational administration professor. Any man who has a decent idea can obtain grant support; he should put up or shut up. Provision for pre-project assistance is an alien and probably subversive notion behind which second-class incompetents hide. ("Research" denotes activity designed to generate and test ideas; however, training and demonstration projects commonly are labeled as research, which may partially account for the prevalence of the notions illustrated above.) Such myths constitute an effective mechanism for maintaining an established power structure, and for aborting threat to senior professors and administrators whose forte is not the securing of new knowledge and the creation of new ideas.

Finally, professors of educational administration are particularly vulnerable to co-optation into academic administration or alliance with academic administrators. Then, administrative demands for order and predictability displace tolerance of ambiguity, diversity, and detached objectivity. Other-worldly ideals and intellectual values become superceded by pre-occupation with power, status, conventionality and happy public relations.[1] The educational administration professor thus may become mastered by his subject.

Excursus on Managing and Understanding

Administering, or simply providing expert advice applicable to current situations confronting administrators, necessitates a stance in many ways incompatible with studying or performing research to attain better understanding of educational organizations. An executive stance demands broadness and eclecticism. An administrator confronted with pressing problems in an on-going educational system will be concerned with pragmatic outcomes, not theoretical consistency and clarity. A scholarly stance, conversely, demands specialization and internal consistency. A student, attempting to

---

[1]Presthus, "University Bosses . . ."

test and refine certain ideas, will confront the problem of achieving rigorous proof. For him, the limits to which all knowledge can be drawn into one tent will become obvious; the differences among assumptions underlying different conceptions will become stark.

To be useful to a school system he would serve at any given time, a consulting expert must accept as legitimate the purposes pursued by the system. Such a stance on values would be extremely inappropriate to a student of organizational behavior. He attempts to develop concepts which are not dependent upon prior ideological commitment. He must seek to identify and push his values to the side so as to develop knowledge which will be pervasive to persons who may hold radically different beliefs. Should he attempt also to assume a helping role, to act as expert advisor, or perhaps to assume some managerial responsibility of the organization he seeks to understand, dilemma is inherent. He risks being drawn into the practitioner's scheme of values; the detached attitude requisite to understanding the practitioner's organization may be jeopardized. In short, a helping role assumes a cooperative working relationship accompanied by boldness and involvement on the part of an expert advisor in improving the practitioner's organization. Conversely, a studying role assumes a cautious, detached attitude on the part of the researcher investigating an organization.[1]

The simple matter of time will deter many persons from attempting to assume both roles. Most men will feel overwhelmed with the problem of knowing sufficient either to do one or the other. If one's stance is to add to a body of knowledge, he will be concerned not only with its concepts but with the processes of conceptualization in general. He will feel constrained to read into the philosophy of science. He will become concerned about methodological issues, the nature of a fact, the nature of an inference. He must become not only a student of the phenomena he is studying but a student of the problems of constructing knowledge. He may be expected to encounter a sense of overwhelmingness, a feeling that this is a bottomless pit into which he is falling.

---

[1]Bennis; Lazarsfeld and Sieber.

One who would offer expert consultation will want to read about everything that is currently happening pertinent to his clients' enterprises. He must know what is happening in many spheres and in this particular time and place. He must know about new possibilities which compete for his clients' marginal dollar and be able to compare their probable outcomes with the established outcomes of present procedures. Here, too, potentially resides a sense of being overwhelmed.

Tactical differences further obviate compatibility. Commitment to understanding as against managing entails a shift in the nature of problems which focus attention. Problems tend to be defined more restrictively. It is not the matter of scope alone which poses difficulties; quest for systematic understanding may dictate problems not necessarily relevant to the needs of administrators.[1] Tenuous relations may be further strained as a researcher directs his attention to lower order participants (frequently, persons near, or at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy). However, understanding of organizational behavior may be facilitated by focusing upon persons whose control is most problematic and who inhabit the area of organization in which the greatest differences in compliance structure exist.[2]

Ways of categorizing organizational phenomena that may be utilitarian for the administrator may be sterile for the researcher. John Walton has noted that "fewer and less precise concepts are necessary for crude manipulation of phenomena than for the understanding of their fundamental nature, relations, and limitations."[3]

---

[1]David Mechanic. "Some Considerations in the Methodology of Organizational Studies," in Harold J. Levitt, editor. The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

[2]Amitai Etzioni. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Glencoe: Free Press, 1961.

[3]John Walton. Administration and Policy-Making in Education. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1959, p. 21. See also Mechanic, p. 145.

The way concepts are organized, too, is of crucial importance. Administrators engaged with operational aspects of a school system require information organized in relation to recurrent problems. Theorists and researchers, on the other hand, require logically ordered knowledge so as to construct meaningful combinations of propositions.[1]

---

[1]Hans L. Zetterberg. Social Theory and Social Practice. Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1962.

Discontinuity is not merely fancied; Paul Lazarsfeld has commented, "A survey which we carried out recently verified our fear that there is poor integration of the findings of research and the practice of administration in education." "The Social Sciences and Administration: A Rationale," in L. W. Downey and F. Enns, editors. The Social Sciences and Educational Administration. Edmonton, Canada: The Division of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, 1963.

Roland J. Pellegrin, too, has spoken of deficiencies: "We believed that the field suffered from the lack of a systematic, coherent, and organized body of theory and principles, a lack we attributed to a scarcity of sound empirical research resting on adequate theoretical foundations. Methodological techniques we found to be limited and relatively undeveloped. It seemed, too, that applied research and development activities rarely rested upon basic research finding. Dissemination programs, on the other hand, were not tied in with research findings and did not seem to reach their audiences effectively.

"In looking at the practice of educational administration, we were impressed with the fact that many current policies and procedures are based upon experience and tradition rather than upon established facts and principles. Educational organizations at all levels are impeded in their functioning by this situation. Equally serious, it seemed to us, was the fact that administrative practice is being modified but little in response to the vast social changes now impinging upon the educational process." "The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration." Paper presented at the meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois. February 10, 1965. pp. 2-3.

Additional dilemmas are brought into sharp relief in Jack A. Culbertson, "Trends and Issues in the Development of a Science of Administration," in Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

ASSUMPTIONS AND POSITIONS

CONDITIONS OF PROSPERITY

If the educational administration professorship is to prosper by virtue of exchanges which may be taken as givens of its institutional context (e.g., a professor will engage in transactions with students, and with other professors and academic personnel; an educational administration professor will engage in transactions with schoolmen), it must provide benefits which enable other parties to the exchanges to enhance their contribution to the over-all effectiveness of the educational institution. Allocation of resources to the educational administration professorship depends upon recognized contributions within the educational system; similarly, allocations to the institutional realm of education depend upon recognized contributions within the social supra-system.

DIFFERENTIATION: INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATION

Differentiation within the professorship in educational administration will increase the likelihood that activities engaged in by educational administration professors will benefit students, other professors, and schoolmen, Specialization in a substantive area such as the economics of education or the diffusion of educational innovations or, perhaps, in a methodological area such as computer simulation is increasingly necessary if the educational administration professor is to have anything of value to say to the student, professor of sociology, or elementary school principal.

A collectivity of disparate specialists is not likely to be as productive as a specialized department or subdivision. Depth staffing in selected areas, even at the expense of coverage of conventional areas if necessary, may be expected to yield high returns. (Use of mechanisms such as the CIC Traveling Scholar Program or a similar arrangement under UCEA auspices might be encouraged by departmental specialization. Alternative devices such as temporary appointments and professorial exchanges might be promoted.

Such means warrant more extensive utilization. Even with the present lack of depth staffing, it is common for students to be taught some aspect of educational administration by a professor who does not possess special competence or interest in the area.) An institution might profitably elect an area of specialization such as the politics of education. Five persons with particular competency in the area might be appointed: perhaps a senior political scientist interested in the political context of education, a senior educational administration professor with developed research competence in community power structure, a junior educational administration professor pursuing study of school boards, and two post-doctoral research associates with appropriate background. Programmatic research might be expected to constitute a substantial commitment on the time and energy of such a staff.

PRIORITY SETTING

Activities designed to increase knowledge about educational organizations and about their relationship with their environment warrant primary emphasis. Activities yielding a low return of generalizable knowledge need to be curtailed or transformed into more productive endeavors. Research on collective procedures in conflict resolution, for instance, should receive high priority. Conversely, a request for supporting service essentially social accounting in nature, such as a survey designed to produce information for the projection of school plant construction needs, should be accorded low priority. It might be taken as an opportunity, however, to promote reallocation of social accounting responsibilities to school systems and state and federal educational units. Too, it might provide occasion to devise ways by which educational administration professors could provide valuable services to operating school systems while simultaneously contributing to knowledge about school organizations. Such a relationship might be devised in an instance in which a school system was experiencing high stress, perhaps reflected in excessive administrator or teacher turnover or repeated tax limit referenda rejections. (A system experiencing high stress may be expected to be largely incapable of analyzing its problems; too, substantial knowledge has been acquired

in fields such as medicine and psychology through analysis of malfunctioning systems.) A team of professors might conduct a systematic case study of the situation, yielding a descriptive diagnosis and perhaps prognosis; ultimately, also, sufficient data about comparable situations to facilitate the formation of hypotheses for rigorous testing.

PROMOTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL ADEQUACY

Instructional activities currently dissipate excessive amounts of professorial and student time and energy with meager returns. Activity may profitably be directed toward development of more effective instructional techniques and materials. Concentration of efforts for the improvement of instructional processes increases the probability of success; both efficiency in the developmental work and probable effectiveness is enhanced by such task force activity. Such work warrants promotion; however, pending the attainment of more and firmer knowledge, both substantive and methodological, instructional developmental work cannot be expected to yield high returns.

Several immediate steps can be taken toward alleviation of instructional deficiencies. Involving students in well-designed service and research activities may be promoted as of substantially greater value than having professors confront students in numerous formal classes. Learning may be facilitated by immersion in an institutional milieu in which the value attached to knowledge is attested by the way in which it is pursued. Obviously, this presupposes professors with the time, competency, and inclination to be so involved. Too, it may not be compatible with a mass production scale of operations.

Students who are bright, committed to a career path necessitating serious study, and able to immerse themselves in study for a prolonged period, are prerequisite to substantial alleviation of instructional deficiencies. Given realistic selection standards, heavy allowances for attrition and for extended programs of intermittent and part-time students would be unnecessary. An effective strategy for

strengthening selection standards entails imposing a somewhat arbitrary and restrictive limitation on student enrollment; if very few students can be admitted, considerable pains will be taken to select the best available candidates. Then, given good students in reasonable quantity, probable outcomes may be expected to attract increasingly better candidates.

Activities which have as a primary manifest function in-service education or a primary latent function of accumulation of "green stamps" for salary or assignment classification, need to be disassociated from credit granting provisions and degree programs. Ultimately, this might lead to the development of reward structures in school systems based upon measures of role performance and entailing competition. Immediately, it would facilitate greater flexibility in devising viable in-service education programs. Similarly, devesting such activities, generally provided through extension divisions, of academic credit and applicability to degree requirements would curtail a tendency for an extraneous function (e.g., criterion measurement for salary schedules) to pervert educational objectives.

THE POSITION: SYNTHESIS AND CRYSTALLIZATION

These arguments may be brought into sharper focus. In essence, if the educational administration professorship is to continue to attain resources necessary to survival and growth, it must provide outputs of recognized value. Whether it is successful depends upon its willingness and ability to set priorities among its functions and to allocate its resources accordingly. First priority should be assigned to research activities; more abundant and firmer knowledge about educational organizations and about their relationship with their environment is a critical factor limiting effectiveness in all activities of the educational administration professorship. Attempting to be too practical with too little knowledge has characterized too prevalent service activities of educational administration professors Curtailment of service activities should facilitate needed reallocation of responsibilities among organizations; too, it should encourage a mutually beneficial transformation of the form and character of professor-schoolmen relationships. Similarly,

de-emphasis upon quantity of educational administration courses and of students, and concurrent emphasis upon involvement of able, committed students in actual research and service activities may be expected to provide direct and indirect benefits. The likelihood of benefits accruing from any of these activities, however, is largely conditioned upon the development of internal differentiation. High levels of competence in complex areas necessitate specialization of organizational units as importantly as of individual professors.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS FOR CHANGE

An innovative program probably will experience an initial competitive disadvantage relative to well-established on-going programs. It requires investment capital: resources committed in sufficient quantity and for a sufficient period to design the program and to test and refine it in operation. The research function, for example, will require special nurturing. Specific mechanisms for this purpose might include long-term initial appointments for persons concentrating upon extended, high-risk research endeavors. Role models might be established through special staffing appointments. Institutional fiscal responsibility might be extended to provision of pre-project assistance and between project support; research appointments effectively dependent upon external funding or "soft money" tend to elicit low value.

Exclusion from normal career progression through restricted "research associate" provisions reflects upon the tenuous status now accorded research activity. Differentiated reward structures and career patterns are needed. They need to be consistent and clear. It is patently dysfunctional to attempt to impose the same criterion measure upon professors engaged in advancement of knowledge through, on the one hand, experimental research on collective conflict resolution, and on the other, a service-oriented case analysis of a school system experiencing administrator-teacher conflict racked by strikes and boycotts.

Establishing differentiated reward structures for activities which are of fundamentally different character may be particularly difficult in multifunctional institutions. At least as a strategy for change, some departments might profitably commit themselves to specialized thrusts. Perhaps some departments in private universities might invest essentially their total activity in research endeavors. Some other departments might take such primary missions as the production of capable operational researchers for employment in public school systems or perhaps, development of systematic case analysis as a methodology for viable service relationships.

Some universities might be encouraged to subsume study of educational administration within a graduate school of organization behavior. Comparative study plus availability of expensive facilities and equipment might be fostered by such an arrangement. Further, new student and professorial talent pools might become more accessible.

Recruitment and selection activities need to be devised which will support differentiated thrusts. For example, disciplinary bases, carefully tapped, might yield more quality professors and students for study of educational organizations and of relationships of educational organizations and their environment. This would necessitate flexibility in selection criteria. For instance, teaching or administrative experience and formal study in education might be considered irrelevant or even dysfunctional for students aspiring to research careers in educational administration.

Increasing specialization may be expected to necessitate prolonged initial preparation and periodically, intensive study of emerging methods and findings in selected areas. Consequently, attention needs to be directed to provisions for post-doctoral study in educational administration. The development of adequate faculties and facilities to support post-doctoral study poses an even greater problem than financing such prolonged study.

Inadequate departments of educational administration constitute a liability to the educational administration professorship. Colleges and universities which are unwilling or unable to allocate sufficient resources to provide an adequate department (UCEA membership criteria suggest guidelines for determining institutional

adequacy; they are applicable, however, only to multifunctional departments) need to be deterred from the field. The sanction of exclusion from organizations such as UCEA may be instrumental in this regard.

Flexibility for continual change may be built into the educational administration professorship through development of varied patterns. Changes now advocated, once attained, will promote need for further changes. Further, currently no singular pattern of organization or any given distribution of resources among various tasks attempted by the educational administration professorship is patently best. A reasonable tactic, ensuring competition and change might be to place the burden of proof on one who argues a proposed new pattern should not be attempted rather than on one who designs and advocates a new program.

Inter-institutional cooperation will be increasingly necessary as institutions become functionally differentiated. Progress in developing viable relations requires associations such as the University Council for Educational Administration. UCEA, for instance, may promote inter-institutional cooperation through activities such as mapping of areas of institutional strength and weakness. Another item high on its priority list might be promotion of research on inter-institutional cooperation. Ultimately, inter-institutional cooperation is crucial to the promotion of continual dialogue and the fostering of a sense of colleagueship among professors of educational administration.

Research on various aspects of the professorship is much needed. The notion of a professorship in educational administration, from a detached perspective, suggests a peculiarly intriguing mutant worth investigating. From the involved perspective of an educational administration professor, research on the professorship in educational administration offers substantial practical benefits.